DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 928 TM 002 723

AUTHOR Boldt, Robert F.
TITLE Trends in Aptitude of Graduate Students in Science.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ETS-PR-73-7
PUB DATE 19 Jan 73
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Able Students; Aptitude Tests; *Career Choice; *Economic Factors; *Employment Trends; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Science Careers; Scientists; Technical Reports; *Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Graduate Record Examination

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to provide some indication as to whether the recent employment trends among scientists is resulting in a drop of the ability of students entering scientific fields, GRE files were used to construct a history of aptitude test statistics for 1966-67, 1967-68, 1970-71, and 1971-72. For the latter three years, students were classified by the department which they indicated should receive their scores. For data from 1966-67, classifications were based on the fields which students indicated an intention to study. The latter means were unaccountably depressed. Declining trends in means were noted for the last three years studied for physical sciences math sciences, engineering, basic social sciences, applied social sciences, and the arts and humanities. A declining trend in the Quantitative score was very strong for physical sciences, math sciences, and engineering, and a declining trend in Verbal scores was also noted in the other areas mentioned above. The trends noted are in agreement with the hypotheses of the study, though such agreement does not by itself imply any particular effective cause. Given these results, suggestions were made for a continuing monitorship of similar data and a validation of trends noted in the history file. (Author/KM)

PR-73-7

TRENDS IN APTITUDE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE

Robert F. Boldt

Research Sponsored by the
National Science Foundation
Contract NSF C740

January 19, 1973
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

TRENDS IN APTITUDE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE

ABSTRACT

The present study stems from the concern that recent employment trends among scientists will result in a drop of the ability of students entering scientific fields. In an attempt to provide some indication as to whether such is the case, the history files of the Graduate Record Examinations were used to construct a history of aptitude test statistics for the years 1966-1967, 1967-1968, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972. For the latter three years the classification of students by field was accomplished using the department which they indicated should receive their scores: A change of reporting procedure dictated that for data from 1966-1967, the classification should be based on the field in which they indicated an intention to study. These latter means were unaccountably depressed. Declining trends in means were noted for the last three years studied for physical science, math science, engineering, basic social science, applied social science, and the arts and humanities. A declining trend in the Quantitative score was very strong for physical science, math science, and engineering, and a declining trend in Verbal scores was also noted in the other areas mentioned above. The trends noted are in agreement with the hypotheses of the study, though such agreement does not by itself imply any particular effective cause. Given these results, suggestions were made for a continuing monitorship of similar data and a validation of trends noted in the history file.

Table of Contents

TRENDS IN APTITUDE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN SCIENCE

Introduction

Concern has been expressed recently over changes in the scientific labor market, particularly for doctoral candidates. Although traditionally the supply of these highly educated specialists has been inadequate to meet the needs of a technologically burgeoning society, more recently some speak of the disenchantment of students with science and others believe that the more promising students do not choose a scientific career. These attitudes probably stem from a growing concern about projections indicating that the vast numbers of Ph.D.'s to be produced in the next decade will far outstrip any increase in open positions. Some forecasts of manpower needs in the sciences and at the Ph.D. level indicate that there will be an overabundance of persons with new doctorates in the sciences now and for some time. Perhaps the market for technically educated personnel at the doctorate level will be reduced for some time to come, possibly because of the decision of private industry to recruit personnel at lower academic levels and to train them in their own laboratories.

If such is the case and certainly if it is widely held that such is the case, one would scarcely expect the vocational choices of the more able students to remain unaffected. Students must, of course, speculate on the most rewarding career in terms of their interests and the activities they enjoy the most, but one would also expect the more aware of them to respond to the realities of probable employment and income. To the extent that these students are potential scientists the cause of science is hurt--and

the evidence is that in physics and mathematics the most able of students are involved. One needs only to accept the possibility that those who are the most able in terms of tested abilities are those who are most aware of employment trends and perhaps able to act on the basis of this knowledge. If they choose not to go into science in order to optimize, in some sense, the quality of their personal experience, the long run effect for the country could be quite unfortunate. It is, therefore, quite important to note and detect trends in the quality of students going into the sciences.

With ample resources one could probably conduct a comprehensive evaluation study of students entering the sciences, using measures that seem particularly relevant and taking measurements periodically in a fashion designed to sense trends of importance in the data. As an initial step, however, it seems much more reasonable to use easily accessible data, both for assessing the past as a baseline and for monitoring future trends. Then, if hints of serious problems are detected, more energetic action could be taken on a real time basis. One set of data which might serve the purpose is the historical file of scores on the Graduate Record Examinations.

The Graduate Record Examinations (GRE)

Since the Graduate Record Examinations are required by many American graduate schools and scholarship programs, the data accumulated and tabulated in connection with these examinations are quite voluminous. They consist of tests of scholastic aptitude, which yield a Verbal and a Quantitative score, and a series of specialized achievement examinations in eighteen subject matter areas. These examinations are enumerated below.

Biology	Education	Geography
Chemistry	Engineering	German
Economics	French	History

History	Music	Psychology
Literature in English	Philosophy	Sociology
Mathematics	Political Science	Spanish

The fields listed above include the sciences as well as other fields that could serve as a base of comparison. Thus, the people taking the examinations cover quite a wide range of specialities. While it may be true that many of the examinees take only the aptitude tests since many American graduate schools do not require the achievement examinations, it is known that the aptitude tests are required for a large variety of graduate departments (Lannholm, 1971).

The choice of subject matter examinations given above could also serve as one means of classifying students according to whether or not they are in a scientific field. Another classification can be made from information from the candidate at the time he registers for the examination, either aptitude or acheivement. He is asked to designate the institutions to which he wants his scores sent, and for each institution he is also asked to designate the department to which he wants them sent. Thus, by identifying the department to receive the scores, the student classifies himself by field. The departments for which codes exist are given below. In this listing, the groups are those that were used in this study.

Sciences and Engineering	Nonsciences
Physical Science	Health Professions
Astronomy	Dentistry
Chemistry	Medicine
Geology	Nursing
Metallurgy	Occupational Therapy
Oceanography	Optometry
Physics	Osteopathy
Other Physical Sciences	Pharmacy

Sciences and Engineering

Mathematical Sciences
- Applied Mathematics
- Computer Sciences
- Mathematics
- Statistics

Engineering
- Engineering, Aeronautical
- Engineering, Chemical
- Engineering, Civil
- Engineering, Electrical
- Engineering, Industrial
- Engineering, Mechanical
- Mining
- Engineering, Other

Life Sciences
- Agriculture
- Anatomy
- Audiology
- Bacteriology
- Biochemistry
- Biology
- Biophysics
- Botany
- Entomology
- Forestry
- Genetics
- Microbiology
- Nutrition
- Parasitology
- Pathology
- Physiology
- Zoology
- Other Biological Sciences

Basic Social Sciences
- Anthropology
- Economics
- Educational Psychology
- Geography
- Government-Political Science
- Linguistics
- Psychology
- Social Psychology
- Sociology

Nonsciences

Health Professions (continued)
- Physical Therapy
- Public Health
- Veterinary Medicine

Education
- Education
- Physcial Education

Arts and Humanities
- American Studies
- Archeology
- Architecture
- Art History
- Classical Languages
- Communications
- Comparative Literature
- Dramatic Arts
- English
- Far Eastern Languages and Literature
- Fine Arts, Art Design
- French
- German
- History
- Italian
- Journalism
- Music
- Near Eastern Languages and Literature
- Philosophy
- Religious Education and Bible
- Russian
- Slavic Studies
- Spanish
- Speech
- Theology
- Other Foreign Languages
- Other Humanities

Applied Social Sciences
- Guidance and Counseling
- Industrial Relations and Personnel
- International Relations
- Public Administration
- Social Work
- Urban Development (Regional Planning)
- Other Social Sciences

Nonsciences

All Other
Business and Commerce
Home Economics
Law
Library Science

Of the two ways of identifying the fields to which candidates belong, the classification scheme of reporting to departments as listed above was used. For several reasons it was believed more appropriate to classify a student according to his intended department, the one to which he wanted his scores sent, rather than according to the area for which he was particularly prepared academically. First, the number of students taking an achievement examination was known to be only a fraction of the tested population; second, the use of departmen. codes would screen out of science those candidates who were applying to a law or business school; and finally, the use of the department code allows a classification of those who had not taken an achievement examination.

One might wish to restrict the population of interest to those who have taken an achievement examination and to examine trends in these scores. However, the concerns of the present study deal in part with the comparison of trends in the sciences with trends in other areas. Clearly, comparisons are at issue, and such comparisons must be made on comparable scores. We are not so much interested in the trends of physics achievement scores for those entering physics as we are in the trends in academic aptitude of those who enter physics, particularly as it relates to the aptitude of those who enter other fields whatever their preparation may be in those fields. Hence, the dependent variables of interest in this research are the Verbal and Quantitative scores of the GRE. From this point of view, the use of cases

who have not taken the advanced examinations is quite justified, and the use of the departmental code as an indicator of the major field is appropriate.

The GRE Population

The purpose of the GRE is to provide to a graduate school evidence that the candidate seeking admission has the aptitude for graduate study and has achieved a mastery of the subject matter relevant to his intended field of study, or at least of some subject matter material which is related to his undergraduate field of study. There has been occasional discussion of the desireability of making the examination useful for hiring purposes by supplying scores to potential employers. However, an explicit policy that scores will not be made available for that purpose, even at the candidate's request, exists. The only purpose for which the examinations are intended, and the only provision for score submission, is that of admissions to graduate school.

In order to provide an adequate service to the candidate and his potential graduate school, a candidate's scores are supplied to score users as the candidate requests within the administrative policy of the testing program. Scores are also recorded on magnetic tape along with information which identifies the candidate and gives a record of his test-taking history and a partial record of the departments to which his scores have been sent. The latter record is not complete because it is used only yearly in the course of regular test program operations, and to store more than is needed on a regular basis would expand a tape file which is already unwieldy. Also, there is an erasing of a candidate's department codes in the event that he takes an examination at more than one sitting. The reasons for this erasure are unrelated to the purposes of this study are are related to the program policies regarding score reports. What is important for this study is that

the department codes available to the researcher for classifying a candidate are those supplied by him at his last sitting if that sitting occurred within the fiscal year. Shortly after the beginning of a new fiscal year, certain information is lost, among which is the department codes for any testing during the preceding fiscal year.

The files of interest to this study are developed from the history files preserved for the convenience of candidates who may want to supply scores to some institution not designated at the time of the candidate's initial registration for the examination. The GRE history file does not constitute a complete history of all GRE testing for the obvious reason that the size of such a file would render it completely impractical. The file, therefore, is reconstituted each fiscal year. In carrying out this reconstitution, only those cases are retained for which there has been activity for the preceding three fiscal years. Thus, the new file created as of June 30, 1972, contains those cases tested during the period June 30, 1969, to June 30, 1972. The file from which this new file is copied contains the information from June 30, 1968, through June 30, 1972, however, and the information on the period June 30, 1971, to June 30, 1972, contains department code information since the entries made during that fiscal year were not yet purged in this reconstitution process. For this reason, the sampling frame was taken as all those records for a fiscal year for which there was department code information and for which aptitude scores exist.

Originally it was intended to stratify the frame by year of graduation since, even though the cases are obtained by fiscal year of testing, the classification of most direct interest is that of candidates who would be part of the same cohort. That is, the study is interested in the scores of

people who would appear at the graduate schools by year, rather than in a grouping by year tested. However, the testing year was adopted as the variable to be used for classification in this study because of the difficulty of constituting comparable groups by year of expected college graduation. The difficulty referred to stems from two factors: first, the testing years studied, though adjacent, must obviously have a most recent and a first year, and though the middle years studied may be fairly well represented by people tested as juniors, say, from the year before, the earliest year will not have people who were tested as juniors the year before. Second, the more important factor which places a limit on the value of the year of graduation is that there had been some incompleteness of the historical GRE files so that data from the fiscal years 1968-1969 and 1969-1970 were unuseable. Thus the end effect noted for the data from the first fiscal year would be repeated in the data from fiscal year 1970-1971. In all, four fiscal years of testing data were available, and these were 1966-1967, 1967-1968, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972. With the loss of the middle two years, it was felt that the reconstruction of data to represent cohorts would be completely impractical, and it was decided that the sample would be taken by testing year. Although the division by year is not the best possible, it should reflect marked trends in the data which might be more closely related to year of graduation and is at least an operationally reproducable criterion for classifying data that might be related to year of the graduation at some time when suitable data become available.

Prior to 1966-1967, the data were unuseable primarily because of the age of the tapes and the use of different formats for collecting the departmental codes. These differences in format are crucial since the data in the

first half of the decade are, in fact, stored on microfilm so that with a sufficient expenditure of time and money they could be made accessible. However, the means of classifying students into major departments would not be comparable from year to year. Indeed, the department codes collected for candidates tested in 1966-1967 were obtained under somewhat different instructions from those for subsequent years, though these data are included in the present study. Those early instructions merely asked the candidate to tell his expected major department without telling him that the information would be used to indicate a destination for his scores. Beginning in 1967-1968 the department codes were identified and used as a part of the instructions for sending score reports. However, it was not felt that the slight change in instructions would materially effect the results of the study, and in any case differences in the 1966-1967 data from the data in other years could be noted with the interpretation of results. With the selection of the four years of data, the means of identifying the graduate department, and the choice of the aptitude test scores as dependent variables, the specification of the population of interest in this study is completed.

Score Comparability

One additional point should be made concerning the comparability over years of the aptitude test scores. Those familiar with the GRE aptitude tests know that the actual questions which comprise the GRE aptitude tests are not always the same. Every year, in fact, a completely different GRE Verbal Test (GRE-V) and GRE Quantitative Test (GRE-Q) are constructed and administered as part of the operational testing program. This is necessary as a precaution against the possible compromise of the tests and is a feature of a number of testing programs which provide data that bear on admissions

decisions and which must be available on a large scale. However, the change of test items introduces a need for some means of assuring that scores obtained on different forms of the test are comparable because candidates who have taken different questions will receive scores that purport to be comparable. To meet this need a procedure called "score equating" is implemented with each introduction of a new form. In intent, the procedure used for the GRE aptitude examinations is to develop two similar populations that are representative of the tested population and transform the fromula scores (the formula is the number right minus one-fourth the number wrong) so that they have the same average and standard deviation in the sample who took the new test as the scores obtained on the sample who took the old test. To produce the two matched samples a practice called "spiralling" has been adopted in which new forms are alternated in the test shipments. That is, when the tests are actually handed out at the testing center, after the students are seated and have no further opportunity to change seating arrangements, the adjacent students actually take different examinations. In this way the two halves of the populations are considered to be quite comparable, and the sizes of the populations involved are so large (on the order of tens of thousands) that random errors of sampling are negligible. Then, given the scores on the GRE scale from the old form and the raw scores from the new form, the formulae given by Gulliksen (1950, p. 274) may be used to get constants for converting raw scores on the new form to scores on the GRE scale. A more complete discussion of this procedure is given by Angoff (1971, p. 578 and beyond).

Brief Statement of Purpose

Concern that economic conditions might discourage the most able students from undertaking careers in science motivates an examination of aptitude

trends in the sciences. It would be desireable to obtain an actual sampling of entering students over the years to detect trends in aptitude, but such a survey is impractical. It is, therefore, intended in this study to examine aptitude averages of students who indicated an intention to study in science departments and those of students whose intended fields of study were in nonscience areas. The data to be used are taken from the GRE aptitude scores of candidates tested in fiscal years 1966-1967, 1967-1968, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972, which are readily available in the history files of the GRE test program.

Sample

A preliminary examination of the historical data was deemed necessary for the following reasons. First, one can see by inspection of the list of possible graduate departments that the number of subjects by which a candidate might be classified is potentially quite large. Thus, an attempt to study trends by department would require a huge sample in order to get enough cases for any reliance on the statistics of a department, and, failing a study by department, a classification of departments is necessary so that there would be a sufficient number of cases at least by type of department. Second, there is a known source of confusion in the information supplied by candidates about the department to which the score reports are to be supplied. This confusion results from the fact that some candidates may mistakenly use the source list for advanced test codes as the key to the department codes. Since all of the test codes correspond with a department code, if the coded number is one of those on the test code list, there is no cue whether the source of the number was the department code list or the test code list.

If it came from the test code list, it is an error. For determining the extent of such errors, a sample of historical data was also needed.

Accordingly a sample of five thousand cases was selected from the 1970-1971 historical tape file. The cases were sorted by the configuration of department codes, and the number of cases for each configuration was counted. The configurations referred to arise because a number of candidates have their scores sent to more than one graduate department. Clearly, the sampling plan would need to take such multiple applications into account, and their existance is a third reason for the preliminary sample. Examination of the tape indicated that in no more than 15% of the cases had more than two kinds of departments been designated and that in most cases the departments designated came from the same groups used in the classifications defining the groups of departments. Furthermore, since none of the groups used were essentially empty, the sample indicated that each group would be well represented. Examination of the cases where a department code was the same as an advanced test code indicated that, in instances of multiple classification of a candidate in terms of the types of departments to receive scores, the test code was more consistent with other departments indicated than was the department code. For example, a candidate might have taken the chemistry test, test code 27, and have indicated department codes 27 and 64. However, as a department code, 27 is American Studies and 64 is Chemical Engineering. Rather than believe that the candidate took the Chemistry Test and then wished his grades to be sent to an American Studies department as well as a department of Chemical Engineering, it seems more reasonable to suppose that the department code 27 is an uncorrected error made by using the Chemistry Test code in the department code space. It is

the agreement between the substantive interpretation of the 64 as a department code and the 27 as a test code that leads one to believe that the copying error has occurred. Such agreement was found in all other cases of obvious disparity between types of departments coded when one of the codes was identical to a test code. Accordingly, it was concluded that indeed such errors were being made. However, since these errors were noted in less than 1% of the cases, it was concluded that, although such an error was occurring, its occurrence was not in sufficient quantity to have an appreciable effect on the study.

The considerations noted above led to the conclusion that a simple sampling rate would be sufficient to yield the required sample. Accordingly, a one to fifteen sampling was made, and then all cases with a missing aptitude score or no departmental designation were eliminated. For each candidate the group of each department code was recorded, the candidates were sorted on the configuration of the group codes, and counts were given for each configuration. This was done for the years 1970-1971 and 1971-1972. For both of these years, the data on persons indicating departments from one or two groups are tabulated in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The diagonal entries of these tables give the number of cases for which one group only was indicated; the off diagonals are for cases where two groups were indicated. Note that the tables are highly dominated by the diagonals which account for 93% of Table 1 and 92% of Table 2. For 1970-1971, there were 84 candidates with more than two groups indicated, leaving the number of candidates indicating departments in only one group constituting 91% of the cases. For 1971-1972, the number of candidates indicating departments in only one group constituted 92% of the total group, including 53 candidates who had indicated departments in more than two groups.

At the outset of this project, it was not known to what extent application to different departments or types of departments is common. It appears that a small minority of the students make such application, but it is not common by any means. Furthermore, it is certainly not clear how to categorize a student who makes such classification, for the purposes of this study. Therefore, the students who have made such multiple applications are omitted, and this study focuses on the more than 90% who stay within one departmental group.

Results

With the exclusions of cases with multiple group application, the remaining students are the subject of this study. Table 3, which gives the data on which the results of this study are based, contains by departmental group and by year the number of cases, means, and standard deviations for both Verbal and Quantitative scores, as well as the correlations between these scores. Variation in the means will be discussed below, but a salient feature of the standard deviations should be mentioned here. The comparison of standard deviations for Verbal and Quantitative scores for 1966-1967 indicates that for the physical science, math, and engineering the standard deviation for the Quantitative score is in excess of that for the Verbal score, but for the other years under study the reverse is true. This result is not in agreement with one's expectations since the quantitative subjects tend to draw people who excell in quantitative ability; their average Quantitative scores are higher and the range of Quantitative scores is usually restricted, as is shown in Table 3 for fiscal years 1967-1968, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972. One may also note the reversal of Verbal and Quantitative means for the math science and engineering groups in fiscal year 1966-1967 compared to those means for physical science in that year, or for any of the groups in the other years.

Tables 4 and 5 give the analyses of variance of the Verbal and Quantitative scores, respectively. The sums of squares of error in these tables are the residual sums of squares around cell means; i.e., the sums of squares left after fitting all parameters. The sums of squares for treatment effects are equal to the residual sums of squares obtained after fitting all parameters but the ones being tested, minus the sums of squares for error. The large numbers of observations in these tables lead to high degrees of significance in all cases, much less than .01, with the exception of the test of the effect of science versus nonscience on the verbal scores where the value of F is less than one. That F is so small as to be significantly less than unity, indicating that the normal model is probably incorrect.

The results of main interest to the present study consist of the relations among treatment means. The treatment effects and averages to be presented and discussed are obtained using unit-weighted averages of the means presented in Table 3. Some of these are primarily of descriptive interest, as are the results cited above. Others are more germane to the issues of the study. For example, the main effect of classification in science rounds to minus unity for the Verbal scale but equals 51 points for the Quantitative scale; the effect of classification in nonscience is just the negative of classification in science; i.e., unity and -51 for Verbal and Quantitative, respectively. For classification by year, the treatment effects are -22, 19, 3, and 1 from the most remote to the most recent years for Verbal and -58, 23, 19, and 17 for Quantitative scores. Here again, the 1966-1967 data are in possible disharmony with the results of later years. However, the examination of main effects such as these do not tell about the comparisons between science and nonscience trends.

Table 6 gives the Verbal and Quantitative means and their differences for science and nonscience by year. In this table, the large positive difference for Quantitative scores reflects the quantitative advantage of the science candidates. Note also the relatively atypical result from fiscal year 1966-1967. If this year is omitted, a downward trend can be noted in the difference from 1967-1968 through 1971-1972; that is, the quantitative advantage of science students seems to be diminishing. In fact, the nonscience averages are holding steady, and the loss is mostly due to a drop in the Quantitative aptitude averages. The part of the table dealing with the Verbal scores shows little change in trend, and thus one might conclude that whatever process leads to the decline is much more highly related to quantitative ability than to verbal ability.

Within the science group, there are differing requirements for quantitative ability and one can examine the data in Table 3 from this point of view, particularly with respect to fiscal years 1967-1968, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972. Note that the decline in Quantitative score over these three years obtains for physical science, mathematical science, engineering, and basic social science but does not obtain for life sciences which substantively would seem to be less quantitative than the others. The quantitative feasure of the basic social sciences would seem to be in the emphasis on statistical material, measurement, and in the case of economics some sophisticated mathematical models. However, for these groups there is also a decline over the aforementioned years for the Verbal score which is not shared with life sciences. Apparently the life sciences are not involved in whatever process is operating. However, arts and humanities and applied social science also share the trend in decline in Verbal scores; apparently the process

producing the trend is not restricted to basic science and is not restricted to fields with a strong quantitative component though the effect is strongest in physical science, mathematical science, and engineering.

Discussion

At the outset of this study, the data from fiscal year 1966-1967 were included because it was felt that certain differences in the way of collecting departmental designations would not affect the purposes of the present study. This decision was made on a priori grounds, and indeed it seems hard to question that decision on purely rational grounds. However, irregularities were pointed out in the data in Table 3--irregularities which occur in almost no other major set of GRE data. Other irregularities in Table 3 bear directly on the interpretation of the results of the study; that is, that all of the means for 1966-1967 are depressed relative to the others, and markedly so. One might be inclined to conclude that the means from 1967-1968 are erroneous and that there is a trend for increasing means (and hence no problem with the people choosing science as a career), that the 1966-1967 data are erroneous and there is a trend for decreasing means, or that neither is erroneous and there have been some unexplained changes in the mid-sixties with a current declining trend. The author's predilection is to question the correctness of the 1966-1967 sampling, though it is not at all clear what went wrong. and to accept the apparent internal consistency of the data from 1967-1968 on.

Declining trends were noted for physical science, mathematical scinece, engineering, and basic social scinece. The trends were much stronger for Quantitative than for Verbal scores for the first three groups. Similar trends were noted for arts and humanities and applied social science, though the trends there are stronger for Verbal aptitude.

Suggested Research

Though the present study is certainly not definitive as to the cause of these trends, the results clearly agree with the original speculation that such trends might exist in the science areas and indeed are not limited to them. For this reason, further research would seem warranted which would verify the existance of the phenomenon and which might inquire into its causes. The present study suffers from a number of limitations including, for example, the fact that the use of departmental designation as a designation of field is an indication of the student's educational plan, or perhaps his provision for one possible course of his future. It is not known whether he actually applied, if he was admitted, and if admitted whether he enrolled. It is not known whether this group that took the GRE is actually representative of the group that applies and goes to graduate school, or how different it is from such a group. It is not known whether the trend noted is a continuing one or a temporary one attributable to a "good" year in 1967-1968. Finally, it is not why the students make the choices that they do, and why they make them differently from one year to the next.

To answer these questions, three sources of data are suggested for further examination. The first of these is the continuation of the type of data collection and analysis which has occurred in the present study. The use of the year-end history file seems like a simple and useful alternative. One would not expect access to these data to be beset with the difficulties encountered in accomplishing the present study because the tapes will be new and the application can be included in operational planning. The analysis is simple, including as it does a minimum of emphasis on complex hypothesis testing procedures and a maximum of emphasis on simple descriptive procedures.

It should be pointed out that a variety of additional information is currently available on the students or could be collected to facilitate more informative analyses. The analyses could be done yearly as the period of the trends of interest would seem to be well in excess of a year. It is questionable whether a shorter term effect would have an impact of any seriousness on science, or indeed whether agencies that might act to counteract changes in the aptitude trends could do so on a schedule that would have their effect within less than a year.

A second source of information would be a check on whether monitoring the condition of the GRE file data provides a valid indication of the aptitude trends in the GRE, graduate-school-going population. For this, a follow-up study of at least a sample of the students whose data appear in the history file would be needed. Currently available are the university to which they applied and the relevant department. These potential recipients of the candidates' applications could be questioned about the subsequent careers of the candidates, at least with respect to their institutions. Also available in the history file is an address for the candidate which was valid at least at the time of the testing and could be used as a place to get information about his current whereabouts. Of course, there is also a record of his undergraduate institution which might have a current address for him. When he is located, he could be approached for information about his subsequent educational experience, and his scores could be reclassified for an analysis similar to one done on the data taken directly from the history file. Agreement of the data on the follow-up students would lend credibility to findings available from the data taken from information in the history file.

Universities in which some students are admitted with GRE scores and others without GRE scores might be a third source of data. It is known that, even where GRE scores are required, not all students actually submit them, and in many places the submission of scores is voluntary. One could obtain from these departments an indication of the standing of the candidates employing GRE scores with respect to others in the department. A shift in these relative standings over time might indicate a national trend which is not in harmony with that indicated in the GRE data, whereas agreement in trends would lend credibility to the history file results.

REFERENCES

Angoff, W. H. Scales, norms, and equivalent scores. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement (2nd ed.). Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971. Chapter 15.

Gulliksen, H. Theory of Mental Tests. New York: Wiley, 1950.

Lannholm, G. V. Graduate school departments requiring or recommending GRE scores for admission. Graduate Record Examinations Special Report No. 71-1. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Table 1

Frequencies of Cases Indicating Departments Belonging To One or Two Departmental Groups for Fiscal Year 1970-71*

	Science					Non-Science				
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Science										
Physical Science (0)	914	4	11	14	6	31	8	50	40	19
Math Science (1)		516	6	24	50	4	1	7	1	
Engineering (2)			428	26		8	1	14	7	2
Life Science (3)				644	6	6	3	4		9
Basic Social Sciences (4)					939	16	38	29	8	5
Non-Science										
Health Professions (5)						2200	12	130	68	183
Education (6)							318	8	3	13
Arts and Humanities (7)								3267	150	71
Applied Social Sciences (8)									2706	53
Other Non-Science (9)										908

*Because of symmetry, only entries above the leading diagonal are recorded.

Table 2

Frequencies of Cases Indicating Departments Belonging To One or Two Departmental Groups for Fiscal Year 1971-2*

	Science					Non-Science				
	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Science										
Physical Science (0)	547	1	3	10	5	13	6	32	24	16
Math Science (1)		348	8	16	42	3	4	4	2	
Engineering (2)			286	11		5	1	7	5	3
Life Science (3)				380	7	3	2		3	6
Basic Social Sciences (4)					633	17	30	13	8	2
Non-Science										
Health Professions (5)						1572	4	57	35	116
Education (6)							254	12	3	5
Arts and Humanities (7)								2277	89	56
Applied Social Sciences (8)									1716	29
Other Non-Science (9)										731

*Because of symmetry, only entries above the leading diagonal are recorded.

TABLE 3

Number of Cases, Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

For Verbal and Quantitative Scores by Curriculum Group and by Fiscal Year

		1966-1967				1967-1968				1970-1971				1971-1972			
		No.	Mean	Std Dev.	Corr.	No.	Mean	Std Dev.	Corr.	No.	Mean	Std Dev.	Corr.	No.	Mean	Std Dev.	Corr.
Science																	
Physical Science	V	653	507	116	.36	427	534	135	.56	456	498	138	.47	314	509	136	.48
	Q		579	124			661	99			642	104			634	102	
Math Science	V	107	479	123	.59	258	534	131	.61	388	516	127	.57	256	513	141	.57
	Q		469	132			686	87			681	93			677	93	
Engineering	V	386	479	107	.53	502	471	128	.51	579	445	129	.47	331	434	135	.45
	Q		463	117			675	83			664	92			646	100	
Life Sciences	V	1930	457	120	.50	513	500	122	.56	855	488	124	.57	565	499	128	.56
	Q		455	126			555	111			552	119			569	120	
Basic Social Sciences	V	602	433	115	.60	1139	553	118	.53	1955	534	115	.55	1417	528	116	.46
	Q		427	106			544	121			530	119			526	118	
Nonscience																	
Health Professions	V	704	484	120	.48	119	493	99	.48	290	494	108	.57	230	499	106	.49
	Q		471	124			480	119			486	122			499	122	
Education	V	107	445	109	.43	1853	471	114	.53	2956	467	110	.54	2059	461	111	.51
	Q		415	109			456	113			459	119			456	118	
Arts and Humanities	V	1390	448	111	.55	1698	570	117	.56	2417	549	121	.55	1539	535	120	.56
	Q		495	123			494	118			493	120			490	118	
Applied Social Sciences	V	64	531	110	.50	264	517	114	.47	803	494	114	.59	667	484	111	.56
	Q		515	134			486	118			482	121			476	124	
Other Nonscience	V	143	477	118	.44	479	504	120	.32	830	501	119	.39	497	510	120	.40
	Q		436	101			504	128			506	125			501	120	

Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Verbal Scores by Year, Science vs. Non-Science, and Group Within Science or Non-Science

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Year (Y)	3	2,208,948.2827	736,316.0942	52.9846
Science vs. Non-Science (S)	1	5,078.9579	5,078.9579	F<1
Group W S (G)	8	10,245,952.1741	1,280,744.0218	92.1611
Y x S	3	101,570.1284	33,856.7095	2.4363
Y x G	24	8,412,136.1151	350,505.6715	25.2221
Error	32,702	454,452,947.5823	13,896.7937	
Total	32,741			

Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Quantitative Scores by Year, Science vs. Non-Science, and Group Within Science or Non-Science

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Year (Y)	3	10,780,023.2460	3,593,341.0820	261.4991
Science vs. Non-Science (S)	1	36,847,156.1307	36,847.156.1307	2681.4876
Group W (S)	8	33,411,532.0090	4,176,441.5011	303.9333
Y x S	3	6,337,665.6372	2,112,555.2124	153.7375
Y x G	24	5,487,629.4625	228,651.2276	16,6397.0000
Error	32,702	449,368,371.0650	13,741.3116	
Total	32,741			

Table 6

Science and Non-Science Means and Their Differences by Year

	Verbal			Quantitative		
Year	Science	Non-Science	Difference	Science	Non-Science	Difference
1966-7	471	477	-6	479	466	13
1967-8	518	511	7	624	484	140
1970-1	496	501	-5	614	485	129
1971-2	497	498	-1	611	484	127